

REMARKS

In the non-final office action mailed on February 8, 2007 claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,473,759 (to Slaney et al.); and claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Slaney et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,231,604 (to von Illberg). Claims 10 – 22 were allowed and claims 3 and 9 were indicated as being allowable if re-written in independent form. Claim 4 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 in connection with the antecedent basis for the term “said differentiator units”, and the drawings were objected to as not showing in Figure each of the filters.

Applicants submit that claim 4 is now in condition for allowance given the amendment to claim 1 that adds “a plurality of differentiator units”. Applicant also submits herewith a proposed amended Figure 1.

Claim 1 is amended herein to include the limitations of claim 3 (which was indicated as being allowable), and new claim 23 includes the limitations of prior claim 1 and claim 9 (which was also indicated as being allowable).

Each of claims 1, 2 and 4 – 23, therefore is submitted to be in condition for allowance. Favorable action consistent with the above is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



William E. Hilton
Registration No. 35,192
Gauthier & Connors LLP
225 Franklin Street, Suite 2300
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
Telephone: (617) 426-9180
Extension 111